

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOSHUA FORDYCE, A.K.A. BRITTANY
FORDYCE,

Plaintiff,

v.

HEATHER SHIRLEY, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:25-cv-00106 (GSA) (PC)

ORDER CONSTRUING PLAINTIFF'S
LETTER AS MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

(ECF No. 18)

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION

Plaintiff has filed a letter which objects to the Court's denial of Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel. ECF No. 18. In the letter, Plaintiff erroneously identifies the order of denial as a Finding and Recommendation, which it is not, thus the Court will construe Plaintiff's letter as a motion for reconsideration of the denial of Plaintiff's last motion for the appointment of counsel. See ECF No. 17.

Plaintiff's most recent appointment of counsel request was addressed approximately two weeks ago. See ECF Nos. 16-17 (motion, denial of same). A review of the instant motion for reconsideration indicates that Plaintiff fails to clearly state how the Court's previous denial was deficient, or on which grounds Plaintiff believes that Plaintiff is entitled to the appointment of counsel. Id. Furthermore, in the instant motion, there is no indication that Plaintiff's circumstances have changed significantly since the Court ruled on Plaintiff's last motion for the

1 appointment of counsel, a mere few days ago. For these reasons, the motion will be denied.

2
3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

4 1. The Clerk of Court shall identify Plaintiff's letter (ECF No. 18) as a motion and
5 identify it as such on the docket;

6 2. The docket entry for the motion shall be labeled, "Motion for Reconsideration (Letter
7 Objecting to Denial of Motion for Appointment of Counsel)," and

8 3. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 18) is DENIED.

9
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: February 25, 2025

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE